



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/883,966	06/20/2001	Koichi Numata	109237	4446
25944 7590 07/28/2008 OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC P.O. BOX 320850 ALEXANDRIA, VA 22320-4850				
EXAMINER				
HANDAL, KAITLYN				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
1795				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
07/28/2008		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Interview Summary

Application No.

09/883,966

Applicant(s)

NUMATA ET AL.

Examiner

KAITY V. HANDAL

Art Unit

1795

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) KAITY V. HANDAL.

(3) _____.

(2) MR. SCHOTT M. SCHULTE.

(4) _____.

Date of Interview: 23 July 2008.

Type: a) ☐ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference

c) ☒ Personal (copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☒ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No.

If Yes, brief description: _____.

Claim(s) discussed: 1, 3, 4, 7, 10, 13, 19-22, 25, 26 and 31.

Identification of prior art discussed: Noguchi et al. (US 4,036,180), Rao et al (US 5,758,496), Yorita et al (US 5,855,781) and Gadkaree et al. (US 5,750,026).

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☒ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Applicant presented arguments as to the obviousness of choosing the combined references in order to arrive at the instant invention as claimed as a whole. Examiner and applicant discussed the prior art as presented in the non-final Office Action dated (4/28/2008) in light of applicant's arguments.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

/Patrick Ryan/

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

Examiner's signature, if required